

# ABSTRACTS OF TESTIMONY

FROM FIFTH AND SIXTH HEARINGS

OF

GEO. DRAPER, ROYAL E. ROBBINS AND W. P. ANDERSON,

REMONSTRATING AGAINST

## More Frequent Payments of Wages,

BEFORE THE

### COMMITTEE ON ' LABOR


OF THE

MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE,

1885.

331-2

M387a



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2017 with funding from  
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Alternates

## TESTIMONY OF GEORGE DRAPER.

Mr. Chairman: It has been my privilege to appear before this committee, year after year, in regard to the matter of more frequent payments. I stand now where I stood to begin with, to protest in the interest of the laboring men against such forms of legislation as this. I am told that it is only corporations that you are legislating for. There are two sides to this question. It is not the corporations alone, but you are selecting out such men as do, and want to, work for corporations, and branding them as not able to make their own contracts, as to how often they shall receive their pay. I say that this is a species of guardianship in which the State is undertaking to put these men into, a condition where they cannot make their own contracts; the Legislature fixing the conditions on which they shall be allowed to labor. I have been an operative for so many years that I think I know something of the effect it may have. I read not long ago a written contract—I happened to come across it—which I made with Edward Harris in 1842. In that contract I agreed to work for him a year at \$1.75 a day; to receive one-half of my pay as I wanted it along, and the balance at the end of the year. Now you propose to say to any operative in the State of Massachusetts that he is not at liberty to make such contracts with any corporation. It is taking away their liberty. It strikes exactly at the root of their liberty. This order speaks of employers and employes. The only definition in the dictionary which I have been able to find is that employes are those that are employed. Under that system I am an employe, the gentleman at my left is an employe; and Mr. Dalton, who testified before you, is just as much an employe of the Merrinack Manufacturing Company as the poorest-paid hand who works there. But you are saying to him, and you are saying to me that I cannot make an arrangement with that corporation, that I am not to receive my pay once a month if I choose. If you look into this matter you will see that if you pass this law, you are passing it so that these people are to be included, in their inability to make contracts with a corporation. Then we are told in regard to this matter that this affects corporations, and not individuals. Certainly, you say, the employe must be paid. But suppose the employe don't want to be paid; supposing the employe says, "I don't want to be paid." Supposing he goes along a week or two after that and you are going to make up a case—I don't suppose you are playing legislate; I suppose you expect these laws to be

carried out and enforced. Suppose I refuse to take my pay, and you pass this law affecting the Hopedale Machine Company, of which I am the agent. Suppose I say I don't want my pay, and they break the law if they don't pay me; what is going to be done? Now, in regard to this matter of employes, I want to tell you that out of these men have come some of the best business men you have got in Massachusetts. Let me illustrate this. There is a member of this committee whose chair is vacant today, with whose father and mother some twenty years ago, when Gen. Banks was in command at Fort McHenry, in Baltimore, I had a letter of introduction to. We called upon Gen. Banks there. His father and mother and Gen. Banks were old acquaintances. There were six of us present who had been operatives in cotton mills, not only the men but the women. Gen. Banks you know, he has been Speaker of the House of Representatives; he has been Governor of the State, and he is U. S. Marshal here now; he is a man that grew up from an operative in the old time, when they worked 14 hours a day, and got their pay once in three months. The father of the member of the committee to whom I have alluded, is one of the largest business men in the State of Maine; he has built, a very extensive manufacturing establishment in Massachusetts, and another in Maine, and is reputed to be worth \$2,000,000. The most I can say is, that I have been a hard-working man, and I have had a good deal to do with industrial operations, and have something to do with them at present. The Legislature undertook to fix it that nobody should charge more than six per cent. per annum for interest; they were not at liberty to make any contract in regard to it. The Legislature found out the wisdom of allowing people to make contracts in writing for different rates. Now, if the Legislature thinks it is best to let the people say that if there is no contract made, the payment shall be weekly, that will be in consonance with regard to interest, and so far I see no objection to it; but, in heaven's name, why should we single out a corporation and those who work for it? If you are going to benefit people, why do you want to benefit one-third part of the wage workers only? Why do you except associations, partnerships and individuals, and so assume to say, We will make such contracts as we please with our help, but we are going to compel you and your operatives to make just such a contract, and no other, as we dictate to you. Now, in regard to the effects of this legislation upon corporations, I want to tell you a slight circumstance; it is not given from fancy or anything of the kind, for you can find the records in the other end of the State House. When I was here a year or two ago, I said that this legislation about corporations was doing the State what I thought was a great injury. Now, to illustrate: I, with some associates, owned a cotton mill in the State of Connecticut. We put in \$125,000. There was a man by the name of Briggs and

his son; they had a cotton mill up in Haydenville, where they had put in \$125,000. We made up our minds that it was important to get this property together, as we thought we could do much better with it. Mr. Briggs had grown up from the operative class that I was speaking of; had worked as long hours as anybody ever worked in a cotton mill, and as faithfully. He has been manager of millions of dollars' worth of property and very successful, and he is a man that it would be very desirable to have as a business man in the State of Massachusetts. After talking the matter over, as he was to manage the mill, the question was whether we should move the machinery we had in Connecticut into Massachusetts, or whether we should move from Massachusetts, in order to combine. Said he: "I have undertaken to run that mill there in Massachusetts, and I don't like the regulations there in regard to corporations, and I would prefer to remove this property to Connecticut." The result of it has been that we have built new tenements in Connecticut for the help, and built a new mill, and moved the machinery there, taking \$125,000 worth of property from Massachusetts. The mill in Massachusetts has been sold for a mere trifle, and the tenements are empty. We have since added \$50,000 more to the Connecticut mill, so that you have \$300,000 of capital there in an industrial establishment which might have been in Massachusetts, if Massachusetts had been a more attractive place. Now, those are facts that you would do well to consider. There has been something said here about the matter of wages, as though the foreign help, which have come in here, were putting wages where nobody could get a living. Now, I had a report of a speech made before the New England Cotton Manufacturers by Mr. Burke of Lowell, in which he had gone to the records and got the amount paid to operatives in 1838, and the amount paid then, in 1876. (I have the books I kept, showing what was paid to the operatives at that time.) The records showed that they were paying in Lowell, in 1876, 77 per cent. more per hour to the foreign as well as native operatives, than we were paying the best American girls—and we scarcely had any other—in 1838.

I am speaking of facts of my own knowledge. There have been questions asked here about the fraud there is in keeping back wages. Was there any fraud committed upon me by Edward Harris when I made that contract and signed it with him, to receive my pay at the end of the year? Is there any gentleman here who will say there was any fraud about it? If not, where is the fraud in any case where a man deliberately says: I will work a month and receive my pay once a month.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Will you please state who the person was who claimed there was any fraud?

A. I say that some member of the committee used that word and used it in my hearing.

MR. RUSSELL. I don't think the report will show it.

MR. DRAPER. I don't know about the report, but I am talking about what I heard and know.

MR. R. D. SMITH. Defrauding the laborer of his interest.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. I don't think it is a question of fraud any-way.

MR. DRAPER. Well, I don't; that is what I was undertaking to make out.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. We can give it another name that will be just as bad.

MR. DRAPER. It is an intelligent contract made by intelligent men and properly carried out; and the operative has the right to say that he will wait a year for his wages, if he don't defraud anybody by doing so.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) How much contract is there to it if a person has got a family to support and has got no money and has got no means of getting a living, and has got to go to work, and he comes to you and asks you for work; you say there is work, under my rule; and he has got to wait six weeks under your rules before he can get a single cent; he has got to do it or else starve his family; how much contract is there to that?

A. Let me reply to you by asking you whether the Legislature is to say that I must hire that man whether I want him or not. I say most emphatically that a man is under no obligation to hire men that he don't want, and pay them what they don't earn.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) I say what is the contract on the part of the poor man who has got to go to work in order to keep alive, and save his family from starving?

A. I say there is no man but what is or ought to be capable of making a contract. If the State has got paupers we have got to take care of them. I say your legislation will make them feel that they are paupers, and that is why I object.

Q. It is a question of existence, is it not, instead of a question of contract?

A. It is the business of the Legislature to provide for paupers. It is not the business of any individual or of any particular employer. They want to get this thing down fine, apparently, so as to make political capital out of it, or to mislead, as they do, laboring classes by putting wrong views about certain things into their heads. They are now trying to cut out the railroad corporations, because they have so much influence. The real thing is to bring this thing down so fine that they can legislate so that it won't affect the people generally, and they can gain political capital by making the people who work for a living think they are their special friends. Now, as far as I am concerned, I stand here as the president of a railroad company; I am running about 20 miles of railroad, costing about

\$700,000, and I individually own nearly one-half of the concern, and I say to you, and I know what I am talking about, that if we are going to be compelled to pay weekly, the railroad I am connected with can pay weekly as well as any other corporation; there is no doubt about that.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. We will bring that railroad in.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Is there any part of this railroad going into Connecticut?

MR. DRAPER. I don't undertake to say that we should move the City of Boston or the streets of the same into Connecticut; but I do undertake to say, and I have brought up a case where there has been corporate property taken out of the State and carried into Connecticut.

MR. RUSSELL. And I inferred from that that if such measures passed, business will be removed.

MR. DRAPER. I have no doubt but what legislation will cause more or less business to be moved out of the State.

MR. RUSSELL. Then it would be the loss of the business of the railroad as much as the loss of the business of the mills, wouldn't it?

MR. R. D. SMITH. I wanted to suggest something for your inquiry, and that is that some of the new mills at Fall River are built on Rhode Island soil for the purpose of avoiding our laws, and their operatives are still living in Fall River. Is that so?

MR. STRATTON. If the gentleman will allow me, I will say that there is a very strong movement in Rhode Island for the passage of the 10-hour law, and they want the weekly payment system, too.

MR. SARGENT. That will make it better for Massachusetts if we don't have weekly payments.

MR. DRAPER. If we had a law like an act of Parliament that would apply to all the States, it would allow one State to compare with another very much better; there is no doubt about that. I was talking with a gentleman from Rhode Island day before yesterday—and by the way he is connected with three or four corporations in Massachusetts—he is one of those that grew up in the mill, he was a back-boy in the mill. Now he controls a large amount of manufacturing machinery and would not have to add much to it to make him the largest manufacturer in the world. They own mills at Readville, Dodgeville, at Hebronsville and a very extensive establishment at Munchaug, and that is only a portion of the property he owns to-day; he was speaking about Massachusetts legislation, and the influence it exerts in regard to its industries, and he don't want to have it work the same way in Rhode Island. To show you something of the amount of business he is doing at the present time, he asked me to supply him with a certain appliance we manufacture, for 2,000 new looms. The 2,000 looms would probably mean an investment of \$1,500,000.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) What State does he propose to invest that in?

A. In Rhode Island. Some member of the committee said they had no right to legislate in regard to associations, partnerships and individuals. If I understand the matter, what they propose to legislate about is employes on one hand and corporations on the other. It is an old saying that it takes at least two to make a bargain. Suppose the law enacted as contemplated; then suppose an employe says to the corporation: "I will not trouble myself to receive my wages weekly, I prefer to receive them once a month." Suppose the corporation says: "The law requires us to pay you once a week, so you must receive your pay or the law is broken, for which the penalty is to be paid." Would you sue the corporation or the individual in that case? The plea that your legislation refers to corporations alone will not hold; your legislation is intended to prevent the freedom of contracts between corporations and individuals. It was absurdly claimed before the committee that it was a fraud to keep back the pay of operatives four weeks before payment because the wages were due as soon as earned. Then it is the same kind of a fraud to keep it back one week or one day, only to a less extent. The average operatives of Massachusetts know better than this. They know when they go to work for a concern that pays once a month and tells them so before they go to work, that that is one of the terms of the contract, and consequently no money is due them till pay day comes round. You might as well say when I give my note for 30 days for \$100, I owe the man \$100 and ought to pay him the day after the note is given. But suppose there is a loss of interest to the laboring man, between a contract to be paid once a month instead of once a week, and you compel the parties to contract for once a week, and in consequence of this you compel the corporation to assume large additional expense to pay weekly, does any intelligent man suppose that they have taken the amount of interest referred to from the corporation and given it to the operatives *permanently*, besides putting the corporation to the extra expense of frequent payments to the operatives, without sooner or later changing the amount paid to the operatives? If so, he must be very fresh indeed, to say the least; if not, the operation would be raising wages by an act of the Legislature. Suppose it should prove that the amount of interest and additional expense would just equal the amount of profits made by the corporations, do you not suppose they would cut the wages down to get it back again, if they could get help at a lower price? The Legislature cannot afford to try to make the corporation pay any given rate of wages for any great length of time. Now, I feel in my bones that the real, true objection to this thing is that you are taking away the freedom of these men, many of whom will be men who will tower above us by-and-by. It is the glory of our

operatives that they can rise up, and this treating them as though they could not help themselves and talking about them in this whining way, is the worst thing you can do. They can help themselves. Abraham Lincoln helped himself. He got up from a miserable position, as it is ordinarily looked upon. And when I hear men of education and means talk as though these men were so poor and so abject that they cannot help themselves (when I have been in their places long enough to know better), I despise all that sort of talk. These men can take care of themselves, and they can take care of themselves better than the Legislature can by singling them out and undertaking to be their guardian.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks the sentiment in his town, in Milford, is in favor of weekly payments?

A. Well, I have no special means of knowing any further than this: That I believe there are several of the boot and shoe manufacturing concerns there that are paying once a week, and their help undoubtedly prefer it. I see no objection to that. As far as England is concerned, I have never heard of anything but custom as regards the matter of paying weekly there. I don't believe there is any law on the statute book that fixes that thing at all, and I think you could just as properly, perhaps, go to work and say that just as quickly as they got their week's pay, they must go and pay their store bills, that they shall not get a month's credit when they get their pay once a week. I think that would be a species of legislation that would be as beneficial as the other. Now, as far as Milford is concerned, I say there are in cities and in thickly populated places—very probably if I was coming down to the city of Boston and was going to establish a factory here, unacquainted with all the help, very likely I should commence paying every week. I presume some of the corporations in which I have stock do pay every week. I am inclined to think so. I think that is a matter which will take care of itself. When I commenced they settled once in six months. I worked afterwards when they settled once in three months. We have come down to where they settle once a month. People who choose, settle once in two weeks or once a week. I think that is fast enough where it is for the interest of the employer and the employe. I think they can find it out as well as the Legislature and can fix the time. I don't object to weekly pay, if you don't undertake to compel people to make such contracts and live up to them. Now in regard to my help, I have never had any application to pay weekly, or oftener than once a month, except those who get short and want money, and they always get it. I employ quite a large number, as an individual. I employ a very much larger number in connection with partnerships. I presume I own in corporations in this State and others, where there are 30,000 or 40,000 employed.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) You never knew that to be said to the operatives of the Hopedale Machine Company? You never made that your business to tell them that they could have their pay weekly?

A. I never have. I certainly have never seen any occasion to.

Q. Well, you didn't think it was particularly your business; any more than some of the other directors or trustees, or perhaps your son, or some of the other parties?

A. I think if there had been any general demand for it I should have heard of it.

MR. STRATTON. My point is just what the gentleman indicates. That while he would look after the interests of those whom he directly employs, and say that he would pay them every week, yet in a corporation he would feel that somebody else was quite as responsible as he, and therefore it is not his particular business to ask them if they want to be paid oftener. For that reason I believe it should apply to corporations; that is the reason I have always taken that stand.

MR. DRAPER. It does seem to me that the men we employ have the right to be independent of you, gentlemen; that you should not interfere to make their contracts. I don't know why they are not as competent as you are, for my part; and I am acquainted with a good many of them.

Q. (By Mr. Carleton.) Among the various corporations with which you are connected, if there was a vacancy and I should apply for it, would they take me if they found I wanted my pay weekly?

A. I presume they would say to you what their custom was about paying, and if you had any objection to make you would make it.

Q. Supposing I should say I would not work unless I was to receive my pay weekly?

A. Well, as far as your working there is concerned, that would depend upon whether you wanted to work or not.

Q. It would not be a matter of contract on my part?

A. I consider it a matter of contract on your part. I don't consider that either side is compelled to close with what the other side wishes unless they choose.

Q. That is what I wanted to know, whether I would have the chance to make a contract?

A. You might have a chance to make such a contract as you wished; I could not compel you to make any, nor you me.

MR. CARLETON. I have got my answer.

MR. DRAPER. Yes, I think you have.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) Your objection to weekly payments is not because you are opposed to them, but because you are opposed to legislation?

A. I am opposed to legislation in a matter of this kind on the ground that it takes away the freedom of the individual.

Q. There is no difficulty about paying them?

A. Well, there are cases where it is exceedingly difficult, and there are cases where it is very easy.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) A corporation matter is not an individual matter, is it?

A. It is the corporation on the one side and the individual on the other that I am talking about. If you can fix it so that you can do anything with a corporation that don't affect the individual, that is another matter.

Q. Can't a corporation have their rules in regard to the admission of any person who comes and applies for work? He has got to submit to those rules or not work, hasn't he?

A. It depends upon how particular the corporation is. If a man should come to me and say he wanted to work for our corporation, we are now paying once a month; if he didn't care to receive it but once in six months, I think we could accommodate him.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) On the other hand, could you accommodate him once a week?

A. On the other hand, I have no doubt we could, if he was a valuable man.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) If you wanted him badly enough to break your rules?

A. Why, it is just here. Is it not unnecessary to talk about compelling men to hire what they won't hire? I hear so much twaddle about that. They will get something in the paper that there is a law in regard to hiring women and minors, and the community are finding fault because he won't pay them more than he can afford to; and not one of them will hire them themselves. Now that is cheap.

Q. There are corporations that will not pay their employes except on pay days, or when they are through work?

A. That is your statement. I don't know.

Q. Now is there any matter of contract about that, except on one side?

A. There would be a contract if somebody accepted it. You seem to talk as if somebody was obliged on the other side. Suppose you go to a store and a man says: "I won't sell you sugar for less than ten cents per pound." Are you in distress because he won't sell it to you for five cents per pound? Do you want me to compel him to let you have it for five cents per pound? Or if you want to go there and get a month's credit—

MR. RUSSELL. I didn't ask for illustrations.

MR. DRAPER. I thought I would give you some, sir.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Why would they ask Mr. Russell so much as that?

A. That is a conundrum.

MR. RUSSELL. You seem to carry the idea that a working man is in that position where he can contract or not as he sees fit.

MR. DRAPER. I know a good many working men who can, don't you?

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Contract as they see fit? Now is it not a fact that a working man must work? It is a matter of necessity with him, that he must work, and therefore he must submit to the rules of the corporation in order to sustain life in himself and family?

A. I have seen a good many men—

Q. Is not that a fact? Give me an answer.

A. There is a difference in men. I have seen a good many men I don't believe the Legislature could make work. Now talking about people—

Q. That is a direct question: Is not the working man obliged to work and to submit to the rules of the corporation in order to sustain life for himself and his family?

A. I don't think they all are. There may be some men in that condition. Now look here. It is cheap talk to say that people are obliged to work for corporations. Suppose a corporation should offer them two cents a day, are they obliged to work for that corporation? I say they are not obliged to. American citizens, American employes have some choice as to what they will do and whom they will work for, and I hope the Legislature will not prevent them from making their own terms.

Q. You say you came here to protest in the interest of the laboring men. Have you ever been asked by any body of them to appear here?

A. I didn't think that was necessary. Being a laboring man myself and one of those concerned on the employes' side, I thought I had a right to be here.

Q. Doesn't it savor of cheap talk when you have not been asked to come here—

A. Haven't I a right as an individual to take an interest? I paid out thousands of dollars towards liberating the slaves. They never asked me to do it.

Q. I understood you to say you had appeared here year after year. Has it not been for the corporations and to oppose this legislation?

A. It has been for the express purpose of opposing this compulsory legislation, and for the reason I believe it is against the interest of the Commonwealth, against the interests of the corporations, and against the interests of the employes that you are undertaking to legislate for.

Q. There are no personal interests involved?

A. I am not aware that there is any personal interest involved

otherwise than as a citizen of the Commonwealth opposed to compulsory legislation.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Are you a member of the Knights of Labor?

A. I am not a member of any secret society whatever. I am open and above-board and ready to answer any question about this matter. It is really a serious matter, if gentlemen will look at it as I do. You can legislate on what conditions a man and wife may get married, but it is not this Legislature or all the Legislatures in the world that can make a man treat his wife as he ought to, or that can make a wife treat her husband as she ought to. And so in regard to corporations, there may be corporations that will treat the help as they ought to, and there may be corporations that will not treat them as they ought to. I believe that corporations, as a rule, treat their help better than individual employers do, so far as my experience goes.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) In regard to the question of railroads, I think you spoke about it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it your opinion that railroads ought to pay weekly as well as any other class of corporations in this Commonwealth?

A. I think they can, as well as many others, and that they ought to, whether they can conveniently or inconveniently; if you are going to make a law, let us cover as much as possible. I don't believe in singling out single institutions and legislating to their advantage or disadvantage.

MR. R. D. SMITH. Mr. Anderson wanted to state one thing about the pay roll which he thought you misunderstood.

MR. ANDERSON. It was simply this: Mr. Bennett told me he didn't understand my answer at the time, and I wanted to make it clear to all the members of the committee. So far as weekly payments are concerned I said that the labor each week as compared with the labor of the month I thought would be, in making up the pay roll, from one-half to two-thirds—am I understood, Mr. Bennett? So far as putting up the money and paying out the money is concerned, which is another branch, it would be multiplied by as many times as the number of payments are multiplied. It is just as much work to pay out seventy-five cents as to pay out seventy-five dollars. And so far as putting it up is concerned, the labor would be increased as many times as the payments are increased. Perhaps the matter of making up the pay roll would not be increased in proportion. That is all with this exception: That it has struck me as a little incongruous that a large number of those appearing here from year to year and applying for this matter are those now enjoying it, and are not the operatives in our mills who are at present paid monthly.



## TESTIMONY OF ROYAL E. ROBBINS.

---

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) You are treasurer of the American Watch Company. How many men do you employ there?

A. At the present time about 2,000.

Q. Are you running on full time?

A. Yes, sir; on full time, but not full handed.

Q. Will you state whether in your judgment it would be a benefit to the State to have payments made weekly instead of monthly, whether it would be a benefit to operatives in general, and how it would work in your form of manufacturing?

A. I cannot see how it would be of any benefit to the State. On the contrary I think it would have a tendency to drive away new manufactories. I can hardly say that old manufacturers established here would be so far discouraged by such a law as to move to another State, but I think it would have a very decided tendency to check the establishment of new enterprises, because it would be an addition to the number of laws which seem to favor other States rather than ours, already existing here. Then as to our people, I am very sure they don't want it and don't need it. I have been treasurer there twenty-seven years, and I have never had a single individual ask me for more frequent payment than he gets, which is once a month. Our system is to pay on the thirteenth of every month when that does not occur on Sunday. That gives us eleven days on the average—two of them being Sundays—in which to make up our payroll for the month. The first three or four days, and sometimes five days, are taken up by departments, our factory being divided into twenty-four different departments. The accountants in these several departments are, the first three or four days, necessarily engaged in making up the accounts of the working people in their several departments. Their reports, exactly as they make them in their own hand-writing, are then returned to the main office. (Producing certain pay-rolls.) These are pay-rolls for a number of months which I have brought here to show the committee, to show them more particularly the method we follow, the magnitude of the account, and the intricacy of it. I should be very glad to have the gentlemen look at them. These are two pay-rolls; they are taken at haphazard, without any selection whatever, to show two or three things.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) Those working upon machinery work by the day?

A. Those working upon machinery work by the day. I should

say that about one-quarter of all our force work by the day, and three-quarters by the piece. These very sheets of which these books are composed are reports from the several departments; and they are taken by our head accountants and formulated into that book.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) As I understand, in the beginning there are certain reports of machinery, and they are paid by the day.

A. One of the departments is the machine shop, and they will find there several sheets of the pay-roll which relate to the machine shop. The machine shop sheets are included, with all the rest of the shop sheets, in the pay-roll for the month.

It takes three or four days to prepare these sheets originally in the department rooms. Then they come to the main office, where they have to be examined, checked, carried out and footed up by two different hands. Then the receipts have to be prepared. That work having been done the last two or three days of the previous month, the time having been added up, the amount ascertained, and the money drawn from the bank, about two days are consumed in counting the money and putting it in envelopes; a part of the day, which is the thirteenth, is taken up with distributing the money to the hands. We have some good accountants out there, and they can pay off our hands in two hours, the whole 2,000 or 2,100. We can pay them off by a system we have adopted within the last year.

Q. How is that done?

A. We take a receipt and deliver it to each hand before pay day. We send it around by the foreman. He takes it home with him, signs it and brings it back, ready for the paymaster when he comes around; the paymaster comes around with his wagon, with the envelopes all numbered, so that 2,000 people are paid in two hours. Ninety-eight thousand dollars were thus paid this morning before ten o'clock. It is a system which certainly is a great improvement on anything I have ever heard of.

Q. (By Mr. Gunn.) Do your men pass by in lines?

A. No; they sit at their benches at work, and it don't take but a few seconds to exchange their receipts, already signed, for their envelopes.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Do you think you could pay four times a month?

A. No, sir. I should regard it as physically impossible to pay four times a month in that room.

Q. Why?

A. We could not apply the clerks to the one duty of preparing the pay-roll so as to bring it out possibly within a week. It has all got to be done within a week. Of course there is nothing absolutely impossible. I mean it is substantially impossible. We would have to employ too many hands to do it; they would be running over each other, and then the work would not be half done. To

have it done in an orderly, decent and respectable way, it cannot be done any quicker, in our opinion, and we have the best men about it that I know of. It cannot be done any quicker than we are now doing it. The system would not allow of our paying once a fortnight. Now the reason why it could not be done in our shop, even once a fortnight, is this: You will see, if you look over those books, that a large number of people are working on piece work; for the most part they are working on monthly jobs. The whole system of our factory is a month taken as a unit of labor and of time. We work by the month, we buy and pay by the month. The work is given out originally from headquarters as a month's duty. The superintendent makes out his cards like this: There is a programme for all the departments to follow. They have to take that up, dissect it and see what their duties under it are, and proceed to give out the work to the hands. They give this man a job that will last a week, this one a job that will last a month, and another a job that will last two weeks, just according as the stock on hand may be, all off the same piece; so that there is a great variety of work and a great difference in the time required for different people to do their work. Some, I say, have to take a whole month about it; they cannot be interrupted in their work; they must go right along with it as they get it. We take out blanks enough for the object in hand, which is to produce a certain number of watches, or parts of them; and they must follow it up in order to do the work economically, without let or hindrance. Those cards, each number that you see there, represent ten watches that are all stamped. They are then started on their career in the shop, the first room being the plate room. The man begins to deliver his goods according to that programme, strictly, to the next department, which, meantime, has been engaged in making, so far as it can, the pieces appropriate. They are all served with these same cards, and they know what is coming. So the work goes through the shop, according to this monthly system, until eventually, these watches will begin to come out, just exactly as they are put in. And to interfere with that system would reduce us to chaos; it could not be done; we could pay once a fortnight. Practically we could make up our pay-roll, but we could not reorganize our shops so that it should be brought down to a system of an account once a week or once a fortnight without destroying the whole administrative economy that we have established after twenty-five or thirty years of work. I should rather pay almost any amount of fine that you might attach for the violation of any such law, than to attempt to change this system, either of work or of pay.

Q. Your objections to this are not based at all upon the fact that you would have to pay the money any oftener, but simply as a matter of inconvenience and impossibility in doing your business, is it not?

A. The mere matter of money is of no account. We always have money in the bank to pay off the workmen as fast as it is due. I don't think there would be much trouble about that. There would be a certain expense. I think it would cost \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year to pay once a fortnight, by the addition of more accountants. But I should not care anything about that. That is not the question at all. Nor is it a question of enjoying the use of our operatives' money. In point of fact, that is a very small affair, if you will consider how much could be saved in that direction. A man earning \$50 per month, at the utmost, could not claim that he should be allowed over twenty days' interest. That is to say, if he is to be paid once a week, at the end of the first week there is nothing due to him in the way of interest, there would be one week's interest due on the first at the end of the second, and so on. So that if we pay him on the first day of the following month there would be about ten days of real interest due him. If he be detained or delayed in his pay until the tenth, say, there would be about twenty days' interest, and a man earning \$50 would be entitled to sixteen and two-thirds cents additional interest.

MR. ROBBINS. It strikes me that does not enter into this at all, the use of the operatives' money.

Q. It is a mere matter of bargain?

A. That is it. Every man who comes into our employ, comes with the understanding that he shall be paid as other people are paid. I am paid once a month. I take my pay like any other workman. It is a matter of pride and self-respect with the workmen; they don't want to be treated as day laborers; they would not have their money once a week. I would not want to be the man to go around through that factory with a petition for weekly payments. I don't think I would be well treated. They are not paupers or imbeciles; they are well-to-do people of the Commonwealth; they and all others in this class, of which the American Watch Company is one; the class of metal workers, metallic goods makers, workers in machinery, in stone, furniture, straw and leather. There are seven different trades I have had the curiosity to figure on. There are seven different trades whose pay will average \$11.99 a week, according to Col. Wright's report; not that all of them are employed by corporations. I have no means of getting at what proportion are employed by corporations and what not; but there are 123,000 men—not women or young persons—in Massachusetts working at these seven trades. They earn on an average, as I say, \$11.99 per week. I have gone through the figures myself, just out of curiosity. Now I say these men are in circumstances of comfort.

Q. How many are there of these operatives?

A. One hundred and twenty-three thousand three hundred and seventy-five.

MR. R. D. SMITH. Well, 130,000 would be half of all the wage laborers in the state.

MR. ROBBINS. I have the list here, and I will let you take it. Now I say those men have not been heard from at these hearings; not one of them, that I have heard of. You have heard from some of the industries, and a most admirable statement from Mr. Dalton, with every word of which the American Watch company would agree. But you have not heard from the men who are the native born Yankee workmen of Massachusetts. Mr. Dalton and those companies which he represents, employ, I believe it is well known—I want to speak with the highest respect of all working people—Mr. Dalton employs Canadian Frenchmen and foreigners generally, in the main body of his mills. But these people I am speaking for, those Waltham people and those I suppose to be in sympathy with them throughout the state, are the native born of Massachusetts, the ingenious Yankees. They are the people who have made mostly the reputation of this State in the mechanical arts. They are the men who fill the churches, who fill the schools, who support local trade and all local traditions. They don't want any such legislation as this, I am certain. They can take care of themselves. They can make their own bargains. They ought to make their own bargains. Why shouldn't they? They make something to sell that we have got to have. We can do nothing without them. And I say we meet on perfectly equal terms when we come to make a bargain in regard to their work in the shop. I have as often to yield to working people as they do to me, in any bargain. Now I say it is a work of supererogation to provide that they shall have their pay once a month, once a fortnight or once a week; I think they may be trusted to take care of themselves. They know enough: they know more than most of us.

MR. R. D. SMITH. Except the committee.

MR. ROBBINS. Well, except the committee.

MR. RUSSELL. Perhaps you had better except the people that sent us here.

MR. ROBBINS. They are the respected and respectable people of this Commonwealth, and I say they don't want any such pauper treatment as is proposed by this legislation, and don't need it. They have got money in the savings banks. I will be bound to say there is not ten per cent. of the people employed in our works at Waltham who have not got their money laid by, and who could not just as well do without their pay for six months as I could. Now, I want to say to you further that there is no suffering amongst our people, any more than there is among Mr. Dalton's people, for the want of money. (Producing a blank form.) There is a form upon which any man who needs money can draw it without leaving his seat, any time during the month.

Q. (By Mr. Smith, of West Newbury.) No questions asked?

A. No questions asked except whether he needs it. Of course it is not open for any man to come and get just as much money as he wants on no pretence or on any pretence whatever, but if he shows his foreman that he is in need of money for anything like sickness or distress, all he has to do is to tell his foreman as he comes along that he wants to draw five or ten dollars; the foreman makes out that piece of paper, he signs it, and the money is brought back and delivered to him at his bench. Now I want to show you how much that is availed of in our shop, in order to show you that they don't need their money. You will see on those pay-rolls there a column "paid on account." Now that column includes, first, the charge of rent, which is in red ink, to those people who hire of us their houses; next, payments to those who are paid in full by reason of their leaving during the month; third, it includes those who have drawn money on account. You will see that in the month of June, if you were to take pains to figure it out, that there were only \$302 drawn in that month; which is less than three-eighths of one per cent. of the pay-roll. In the month of October there were \$631 drawn by thirty-one people, which is less than one-half of one per cent. of the pay-roll. And that with perfect freedom of asking for all the money they want on any reasonable occasion. I don't know that I have anything further to say.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) Can you give any reason why they should not ask for more money in the month of June?

A. No, sir.

Q. Don't you have a vacation about July?

A. No, sir; not oftener than trade ordains.

Q. Do you have any part of the year for vacation?

A. Not a day, if we can help it.

Q. I thought you gave the employes two weeks every year?

A. We don't unless we are obliged to.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) From want of work?

A. Want of work. If trade is bad we give them, as we did this year, thirty days at a time. The year before we gave them fourteen days; the year before that we would not give them one, not one in the whole year.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) Do you do your work upon the piece system?

A. About three-quarters of it, as you will see by the pay-rolls.

Q. How many parts are there to the parts that you give out?

A. Average about 140; and the number of processes or operations which these pieces pass through is 3,740.

Q. Do you carry 140 parts through your books?

A. Yes, sir; more than that, a good deal; because all watches are not alike. One hundred and forty parts would be about the

number that some watches would take, but these parts would not necessarily be the same, exactly, as go into other watches, because we make about forty different varieties of watches.

Q. What I want to get at, is, the number of parts you carry through your books, so as to get some idea of the amount of labor you have in making up your pay-roll. You say you carry through about 140, and that is the average perhaps.

A. That is the average of all the watches, but I say there are forty different sorts of watches, some of which would take just the same parts in just the way they are ordinarily made.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) Here is a man who takes out a certain part. Perhaps he may go through one, two or three performances upon that one article, but still it goes out as one. Is there any such thing as that?

A. Well, yes. We have, for example, pinions. They are in the first place cut off from wire. Then they are given to girls, mostly, to begin the turnings upon them. They ordinarily have to turn about nine different turnings, which they do by a diagram.

Q. Does the same girl do that?

A. Yes.

Q. There are nine turnings, but it don't necessarily go through the hands of nine girls?

A. One girl will do those nine turnings, and those are one-ninth of the piece. It would then go to those who cut the leaves by machinery. From there it would go to those who do some turning by hand; a little guttering has to be made to prevent the oil from running. Then it has got to go to the polisher. All different parts of the same piece. So that a pinion, probably, before it is finished as a pinion, before it is attached to a wheel, will have gone through a dozen or fifteen different hands—that same pinion.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) I understood you to say you could not stop at any other time except a month to make up the pay-roll, or the account of any man's work?

A. It is frequently so.

Q. (Referring to the pay-roll.) I want to know if you cannot stop this piece work any minute you go in there and ascertain just where that man stands in regard to his work?

A. No, it would not be practicable to do that.

Q. Not practicable, perhaps, but can't you do it?

A. I can shut up the shop if you like.

Q. Can't you get to any man's overseer and find out just how that man stands?

A. No, sir; not any time during the month. We will suppose a man has taken a monthly job.

Q. Suppose he has taken a weekly job?

A. He would take it at a higher price. It could be sub-divided,

but the man would charge a higher price for doing it. It must be so or else we must get a less amount of work. I want to say that the man who takes his monthly job has got a great variety of work to do on the pieces he has taken. He goes along on them as fast as he can. By the time he gets some of his pieces on one stage, others will be at another stage, and he intends to bring it all out at the end of the month as finished work. Then he can count up all the different operations that he has gone through and make his return properly. But I don't think it would be practical or possible to break in upon his work, done only in a small proportion, it may be in some cases, and a larger proportion, in another, and find out just what is due to him. The calculation never has been made in our shop that I know of. A man has taken 35,000 pieces; he may have arrived at the 34,000th piece, but he won't know that he has arrived there. He keeps along. So with all the rest of his pieces. Other people in his employ will have got hold of some other piece of work. They are all pushing it along so that at the end of the month it shall be brought out as finished.

Q. It seems that in these accounts 100 is the unit of amount and that the price is so many cents. Therefore, at any time you can find out what is due to the men?

A. There is no difficulty in figuring out the amount; it is the work that we cannot figure.

Q. Will you explain the fact that individual firms usually pay weekly, if you think that weekly payments will drive business out of the State?

A. I can suppose that people located here in Massachusetts, if they had an opening for an enterprise, would not be deterred by the difference in the cost of paying weekly or monthly; they are not going to pull up stakes and go to some other State.

Q. I don't think you understand it. We have no law here now, yet a great many individual firms are paying their men weekly as a matter of policy.

A. It may be convenient for some people to do it. If we were a small concern and our work was not complicated in this way, I should not have any objections to paying weekly, not at all; that is, if our work people wanted it. It is on account of the practical difficulties in our case and in the case of all large corporations making complicated work, that I object to it.

Q. I wish to ask you in regard to those seven trades you have named—do you know of any corporation engaged in those trades?

A. Yes, a good many.

Q. Will you name them?

A. Well, the Oliver Ames Plow company for one; and the Washburn & Moen company of Worcester for another.

Q. Under what heading have you got them?

A. They are both metallic goods. They are corporations.

Q. Please name any others. Please name as far as the data you have got there, and give us your opinion about corporations working at those trades. You have given us two instances.

A. I have drawn those figures from Col. Wright's report.

Q. Several of these have come up before the committee before and it has been stated that they were not generally corporations, and that they didn't pay but seven, eight or nine dollars per week for adult male labor.

A. Well, I have no means of separating those incorporated from those not incorporated. I naturally infer that the larger proportion of this is distinguished from boots and shoes, which I have not included here; and from clothing, which I have not included, and which is a very large item.

Q. I beg your pardon. Is the detail of your work reported to your office before the end of the month?

A. No, sir; not to the main office. It is kept track of by the subordinate officers all the time.

Q. It is reported by the overseers to the subordinate officers?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often?

A. When a man has finished his work, or when he has got a job so far along that he sees he can report it, he reports it.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) It is inspected, I suppose?

A. It is all inspected.



## TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM P. ANDERSON.

---

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Mr. Anderson, you are paymaster of the Pacific Mills?

A. I am.

Q. How many are employed at the Pacific?

A. There are at present on the books something over 5,300.

Q. How often do you pay?

A. Once a month.

Q. I wish to ask you in the first place whether it would be very difficult for you to pay weekly?

A. Practically it would be impossible.

Q. Will you tell why, to the committee?

A. Because of the labor and because of the risk. I have brought with me to-day the papers which I used in making up a single pay-roll.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) What kind of manufacture is this?

A. Cotton and worsted. The pay-roll has upon it the name of the operative, the number of the room in which he works—we don't number from one up to 5,000, but we number them by rooms for convenience, and for keeping the numbers as small as possible—the number of hours worked by the operative, the amount of work done by the operative, with the price for piece work and for work done by the hour, the gross amount due to the operative, the deduction due for rent, if they are in our tenements, and the net amount due each operative.

Q. That is all shown on the book before Mr. Russell, is it?

A. It is all shown on one book before one of the gentlemen of the committee. In paying, a time bill is given to each operative, and I have brought the time bills here, of which this is a sample. There are seven boxes. Each operative is given a time bill upon which is written the name, the number on the pay-roll, the number of the operative, the hours worked, the piece work done, with the price for each piece, and that is signed by the operative. I have brought here these seven boxes containing the receipts for one pay-roll. The boxes are all classified and they are all full. The seven boxes contain over 5,000 receipts. These time bills are made up before the pay-roll is paid. They are looked over by the operatives, are signed by the operatives, and then are handed to me, as I go from room to room. In exchange for these receipts I give each operative an envelope containing the money due them; each operative has an oppor-

tunity for seeing whether the work for which he or she is to be paid is correctly stated, and whether they are to receive the amount which is properly due them. These seven boxes contain simply the receipts for one pay-roll, and they will be the same under a weekly or fortnightly system of pay as they are under the monthly system of paying. In connection with making up the pay-roll you will see by looking over the boxes that there are more or less yellow bills. A yellow bill denotes that the operative is through working and receives his pay at the time of leaving; and that necessitates a list being kept of all these operatives who receive their pay before the time books are received and the pay-roll is made up. Those are kept in this book. (Another book). And I was surprised, on talking with some gentleman, not of this committee, but of a previous committee, at the misconception that was in his mind as to the number of operatives leaving in the ordinary course of business, from time to time. This book contains the daily payments of those who leave immediately prior to the time of payment. Here is a month;—I take it without knowing anything about it—in that month there were about 350 who had left before the time of payment. If the gentlemen would like to see this book, it contains simply the daily record of those who are paid before the regular time of payment. You will notice in the margin of the pay-roll dates against some of the names. Those represent those that were paid before the time of leaving.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) You mean that they were paid before they left?

A. Yes; before the time of paying the roll. I have brought with me this pile of books which represents the books which we have to go through with each month in making up the time and the amount of those employed simply in the print works. This contains the daily time and work of each, and has to be figured up and carried into the pay-roll. In the print works the work is all paid by the day; there is no piece work. These books contain the record of each man's time, each day, which has to be footed up and carried into the pay-roll.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) About how many are employed in this department?

A. I think there are in the vicinity of 800. I take the mill as a whole, and I don't always classify the different sections, because it is not paid in that way. These papers here represent the books and the papers which are required each month. These sheets which I hold in my hand contain the daily record of the product of each loom in the cotton mill; these sheets are hung up in the room and the operatives have access to them each day to compare the cloth taken off the loom with the amount recorded upon these sheets, which are called cut-sheets. They are the record of the pieces taken off, or woven, in each loom.

MR. R. D. SMITH. I would like to have you show these sheets to the gentlemen of the committee.

MR. ANDERSON. I have enough, almost, to give each one a sheet. Those sheets do not show the amount of work by any means, because they simply contain the number of pieces taken off of each loom. There is nothing by which you would designate that the cloth taken off was not all the same as regards character, quality and price. That is marked here in a way that is known to the overseer or to the one who has the matter in charge. On turning over the first sheet you will find a summary—on the back of the first sheet—which has to be drawn off each week, showing the classification of the work that it may be put on to the pay-roll as regards the price to be paid for doing the work.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) The work you refer to here is piece work?

A. That is piece work in the weave room. Now as regards the carding room or roping room, the work is somewhat the same, where the work is done by the piece. Also as regards the spooling and warping of the yarn. That is, to a large extent, done by the piece, and that has to be kept somewhat in the same way. The spinning of the yarn is also the same so far as the mule spinning is concerned. We can give you any amount of details so far as the work is concerned. This is, simply as regards the cotton mill. Now I have got something more that may interest you. So far I have only spoken of the cotton mill, the print works, and the simpler portion of the mill. I come now to something which has still more detail to it, and that is, our worsted department, which comprises not only the manufacturing but the dyeing and finishing. It is equal in detail to both of the other departments of which I have spoken, and I have here simply the monthly papers required in making up the monthly pay-roll.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) Do these columns here represent the week's work?

A. No, sir, each column represents a day and the total of that represents a week. You must remember that these numbers here represent the looms and that the operative will run all the way from 4 to 6 or 7 or perhaps 8 looms in the cotton department on plain work. Where it is engine work or jacquard work, of course they can't run as many.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) Do you say that is a summary of the week's work?

A. This is a summary of the week's work, if you would like to see it. (Another book.) This book which I hold in my hand represents the time book of the repair shop. It is simply a monthly book, and represents the time of the mechanics, carpenters, machinists and laborers that work. (Another book.) This package of books represents the time of each section in one spinning room.

There are in the vicinity of 400 in that room, and these books each represent the time of each section. This little package of books (another package) represents the time of the work done in the wool sorting room. These figures here show the amount of wool sorted by each of the different hands; there are, however, different prices for each of the different classes or qualities of wool. This little package of books (another package) represents the time of the dyeing department in the worsted mill. This is all hour work or day work. This is the packing room, which is all day work, and this is the wool combing and drawing room, and represents the time; that being done by time or by the machine which is its equivalent. This little package (another package) represents the work in the dressing room, which comprises the warping and spooling; and this, being part time and part piece work, is recorded in this large book. The large book is not all for one month, but has to be used for each month. This book (another book) represents the spinning room, in what we term the little cotton mill, which is down in the worsted department, and makes the yarn to go into the worsted cloth. These two books (two other books) represent the carding in the little cotton mill similar to this spinning room. It cards the cotton for this spinning room. And this being part time and part piece work necessitates the overhauling of these books. Now I have come to a small package here which comprises the labor of simply the weaving in the worsted department for one month, similar in character to those papers which you have before you, but comprising very much more detail, as the prices are very numerous, as you will see. If one of these gentlemen will turn to the latter part of that pay-roll—I might turn to it for you, being more familiar than you are, I can show you at a glance what I mean—this being the name of the operative, with the number against it on the left hand side of the page, you will notice the hours which are put here, which comprises the hours of work for each week; and in connection here on the line corresponding to the name of each operative, is the amount of cloth woven by that operative during that month, put under the price which is paid. There are 22 prices on that page.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) Let me ask you one question. Is it first divided into weeks?

A. We first start with the days, sir.

Q. Then it is compiled and made up into weeks?

A. Yes.

Q. Then from that you carry it out into months?

A. Yes.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Now, you speak of the number of prices. Each individual does not do work at so many prices?

MR. BENNETT. There are not over five for any one operative.

A. They will get sometimes 8, 9 or 10.

Q. From one to ten?

A. Yes, sir. I judge a majority will run from one to five.

Q. An average of four or five?

A. An average of four or five prices, yes, sir; and that is likely to occur each week. I will open these sheets if you would like to see them. They are similar in character to what you have there; only it is quantity.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) If I understand, you employ 5,200 hands.

A. Yes, sir, a good deal over 5,000 right along.

Q. An average of 5,000?

A. It would be more than 5,000 on each pay-roll. I don't know of a pay-roll that has run under 5,000 and I have known them where they have run up to 5,600 or 5,700; perhaps 5,000 or 5,300 would be an average.

Q. How long does it take to make up your monthly pay-roll? I mean how many days?

A. We seldom get these books out of the mill till the last of the week.

Q. Each week?

A. No, at the end of the pay time. We should not expect to get these until—perhaps we might get one Thursday afternoon, but Friday or Saturday we should expect them. Sometimes we haven't got them until the week following. There is so much detail work upon it, and care is necessary to avoid mistakes, that it requires a good deal of time, and it is work which, with our rooms being so large, cannot be spread over a great number of people.

Q. Now, how much time do you consume in making up the pay-roll? How many days?

A. We seldom get the pay-roll finished until Tuesday or Wednesday of the second week; that is eight or ten days.

Q. Commencing when?

A. Saturday.

Q. (By Mr. Gunn.) For the previous month?

A. Yes, sir, for the previous month.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) How many men do you employ to make it up?

A. That is a question that is very difficult to answer, because these books up to a certain point are made up in the mill, each room making up its own books.

Q. They are being made up each day?

A. Each week.

Q. Each day, are they not?

A. Well, the work is being done.

Q. And it is largely made up at the end of the week?

A. So far as the gross amount of work done is concerned, it is footed up each week, so that we know how much has been produced in that room.

Q. And it is also classified?

A. It is classified also.

Q. Here is a sheet here with 180 looms ; at the end of the week you know just what has been done.

A. We know so far as the whole room is concerned.

Q. It is really made up once a week?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the end of the month you put the four weeks together?

A. Yes, sir, four or five.

Q. Really, you first get it into weeks, anyhow?

A. Certainly, certainly ; but let me state right here, in order that you may understand it, the aggregate amount of work done each week is made up ; at the end of the month that work has to be divided as to the prices to be paid for that work, and that is different from simple totals.

Q. Well, substantially the same?

A. No, sir, not substantially the same, because it is very different. If the weaver has got off during the month 100 pieces the aggregate is 100 pieces ; if the weaver is to be paid five or six or seven prices, that work has to be gone through and classified as to the character of the work done, and the price to be paid for doing it, which multiplies the work.

MR. BENNETT. Certainly.

MR. ANDERSON. And that would be the same in a weekly system of payment as in a monthly system?

Q. (By Mr. R. D. SMITH.) It would be as much work?

A. No, sir ; it is not so much work because it would not be so many kinds, but the same formula of work would have to be gone through week by week as is now gone through month by month, with the simple exception of adding the different weeks together, that would be all.

Q. Well, Mr. Senator Bennett was asking you how much time it took, and you said that so far as the work of making up the accounts of the work was concerned, it would be very difficult for you to estimate. I wish to follow the inquiry of Mr. Bennett, and ask what force of clerks you employ?

A. From the time the pay-roll is closed, that is, from the time that we call "Pay is up," there are two and sometimes three at work on it until it is completed.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) Now, give us in days' work, as near as you can, the amount of time ; I would like to get at the amount of time.

A. You mean so far as my office is concerned ?

Q. The entire labor.

A. Well, that is what I told you. It is very difficult to estimate the amount of time that goes into the making up of a pay-roll.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) Do you keep a clerk specially in each room?

A. No, not specially; in some rooms the overseers make up the time, and in one department there is a clerk who has the carding, spinning and dressing, which comprises five rooms. So far as the weaving room is concerned, there is a clerk for each room. And from the weaving room, as I told you, these books do not get around to us for nearly a week after the pay time is up. The time books have simply the time each day, and these are carried into my office and carried on to the pay-roll, and everything is done there. Where it is piece work it is simply done in the room, and we simply get the results which we have to figure up in the office; so that it is difficult for me to tell how much time is taken up, because the overseers and clerks, so far as there are any clerks, work many times late into the night in order to get the sheets out to us; and then when they get into the office they have to be gone all over and examined, and the detail of the office attended to so far as discharges have been made or operatives have left and have been paid.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) Well, your overseers keep an account every day of the operatives and of the work they do?

A. Oh, yes, indeed.

Q. Do they return that once a month, or once a week, or every day?

A. They give that once a month.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Well, the majority of your work is day work or hour work, as near as I can judge by looking over these bills. Three-quarters of it is hour work?

A. No, sir; I should think fully one-half of the work was piece work. You will see the piece work on the left hand; it does not show upon the right.

Q. If it is made out a certain price per hour, that would indicate that it was hour work?

A. Not necessarily, because an operative may work part by the hour and part by the piece. I should think fully one-half was upon piece work. Running over the pages would not assist you in determining; it might mislead you. I speak from practical experience in that matter; it is not a matter of guess work.

MR. RUSSELL. Well, a book is pretty practical evidence.

Q. (By the chairman.) There seems to be a great deal of work in making up the pay-roll. I suppose you have made some effort to simplify it?

A. Yes, sir; we have made a good deal of effort to simplify it, and I can assure you that we do no work for the sake of doing work; there is plenty of work to be done without multiplying it. The great matter is all the time to see how the work can be simplified and at the same time correctly kept. The matter of correct-

ness has as much to do with it as the matter of simple manual labor. It is hardly a question of a little extra work—that does not signify so much as the matter of correctness.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) You pay your operatives by the month?

A. We pay them every month; yes, sir.

Q. What do I understand you to mean by a month; I want you to define what you constitute a month?

A. I say we pay them every month. Our month ends the last Saturday of each month. We pay them twelve times a year.

Q. I notice here Sarah Young, 300 hours, 128 pieces at 36 cents a piece. The number of hours, I presume, you keep for some reason of your own; now, if you pay by the month I only wanted to know how you got in 300 working hours in a month for that lady.

A. That happens to be five weeks. You cannot pay twelve times a year and pay every four weeks.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) How many hours do you reckon for a month?

A. Four weeks is 240 hours, and 5 weeks is 300 hours.

Q. And this was for five weeks?

A. That was for five weeks.

Q. There is one for 282 hours, and there are several for 300 hours; that means a little more than a month, I suppose?

A. That is what I say; there will be four times in a year when they will be paid for five weeks; you cannot avoid that in paying monthly.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) You do that because it is easier to get at a weekly account?

A. It fixes the time and makes the month come regularly; the operatives all understand it, and the time is not changeable as it would be if we paid every four weeks.

Q. Excuse me, but isn't that paying by the week? Your system is a weekly not a monthly system?

A. No, it is a monthly system; we pay every month.

Q. No, it is only once in a great many months that you pay to the end of the month.

A. If the last Saturday of a month happens to be the 30th or the 31st, then we pay to the end of the month.

MR. RUSSELL. That is very seldom.

MR. STRATTON. He says he pays once a month, and then he says he pays for five weeks in a month; that is not a month, is it?

MR. R. D. SMITH. Yes, it is; in the month of March.

MR. STRATTON. They figure their books by the week, and make their payments once in four weeks or five weeks; that is all the point I wanted to make.

MR. ANDERSON. We pay 12 times a year, and so far as time is concerned, it ends the last Saturday in the month?

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) You call that your month?

A. It is not the calendar month.

MR. RUSSELL. There is no need of any misunderstanding. It is a question of four or five weekly payments with you.

Q. (By Mr. Stratton.) Is it a question of monthly payments, or is it a question of weekly payments?

MR. RUSSELL. That is what I asked.

A. You can have it to suit yourselves as far as that is concerned. It is simply a matter of words; I say we pay once a month, or 12 times a year, and the month ends, as a matter of convenience, on even weeks, the last Saturday of the month.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) This system of accounts is founded on a weekly account, isn't it?

A. No, sir.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) You say "the" month. Will you tell me what month it is that has five weeks in it?

A. It is the month where from the last Saturday of the previous month to the last Saturday of the present month there will be five Saturdays.

Q. Then you establish another month, which is composed of parts of two months, do you not?

A. I don't exactly understand the meaning of your question.

Q. You establish a month which is composed of two calendar months, do you not?

A. Sometimes it is, and sometimes it is not. I tell you that our month ends the last Saturday.

MR. RUSSELL. If you call it "our month" that is all right.

MR. ANDERSON. Well, the mill month as is usual in all mills—you could call it Wednesday or any other day, but for convenience of reckoning Saturday is taken, and the last Saturday of the month ends the month so far as reckoning is concerned.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Now, through all this part of the book, apparently more than half, I find very little, if any, piece work.

A. Well, it is there.

Q. Now, the day work is carried out so many hours at  $7\frac{1}{2}$ , 8, 10, 14 cents an hour.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, in your judgment, is that the simplest form of work in accounting that you can make out?

A. Well, is that a fair question? I am perfectly willing to answer any question, but that is a matter of opinion entirely.

Q. I wish to get at your opinion as an expert. It is just what we are sitting here for.

A. Yes, sir; I should say, most decidedly, that it is. Our time is kept by the hour, and it is as good a system as could be.

Q. Then, passing from that to the piece work, I find here—there is not so much as I thought there was—

A. Well, it is there.

Q. Here is 21 at 24 cents, and 26 at 24 cents, and it is carried out as a month's work ; now, that is not very intricate work.

A. No, it is not.

Q. A good bookkeeper could make pretty rapid work at that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, another point ; this book, at the end of the month, goes into the different rooms to be made up?

A. No, sir ; it comes out.

Q. This book ; not the amount?

A. Not entirely ; some part of it is done in my office.

Q. A gentleman told me that this book was made out in a different room and never went into the office. I didn't know how it was made, but he kindly came round and told me that this book went out into the different rooms to be made up.

A. Part of that book is made up in the rooms, and part of it is made up in my office ; after the sheets come into my office they don't go back into the mill again.

Q. Why I asked the question is this : You say it takes several days to get returns from the different rooms ; now, I thought if this book had to go into a certain room and remain there until the work was carried on to the books, and was then passed from that room to another and remained there, that accounted for the long time required in making up the pay-roll.

A. That would cause delay and trouble, but nothing of that sort is done. This book is simply bound after the pay-roll is finished. It is all in sheets. This first part of the pay-roll is all in one hand-writing, and that is done in my office.

Q. (By the Chairman.) From the time the books are received from the mill, how long a time and how many clerks are employed in making up the pay-roll?

A. From two to three are employed a little over a week.

Q. (By Mr. O'Sullivan.) After it leaves the room?

A. After it leaves the room.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) In other words, it takes about 18 days' time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the outside?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. From 15 to 18 days is consumed by making up your pay-roll? Now provided you made up this pay-roll once a week, how much time would it require to make up the pay-roll?

A. So far as the time is concerned, it would not require quite as much. It would not require quite as much time to make up the pay-roll each week as it requires to make it up each month.

Q. You mean four times as much?

A. Let me be understood. To make up the pay-roll in one week for one week, would not require as much work as it does to make up the pay-roll for the entire month.

Q. Proportionately?

A. No, sir. It would not require as much work; it would be less work.

Q. Well, how much less?

A. Well, I should say from a half to two-thirds.

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. Bennett, that you may understand what I mean, I am taking one week, and I am taking one month on our pay-roll. I am not taking four times a month, but simply one week and the time it would take to make up the pay-roll; one week as compared with the labor required for making up one pay-roll as now, a month; and I say that for making up one pay-roll at the end of the week, simply making up the pay-roll, would require, in my opinion, from one-half to two-thirds as much labor as is required now for making up the pay-roll at the end of the month.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) It don't seem to me possible when this is all sent in practically to your office.

A. No, this don't come into the office; these are kept in the weave rooms.

Q. Well, they might as well be; they are made up weekly.

A. Mr. Bennett, please understand—and I thought I was understood—the numbers there represent simply the number of the loom, —each loom. This is the product of each loom. Now, a person working in a room may work two, three, four, five, six, or more, looms, and there is nothing on that sheet which shows who is running that loom; it is simply the loom product; in order to get at the amount of work done by the individual, the overseer must take that sheet and draw it off against the individual's name, and give the individual the total amount of work for the total number of looms the individual is running.

Q. Then your idea is that if it takes from 15 to 18 days' time to make up your pay-roll monthly, if it were made up weekly it would take about twice as many days?

A. Well, two or three times as many.

MR. R. D. SMITH. Twice or twice and a half as many.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) Which would be from 30 to 36 days?

A. Yes, sir, that would be it.

Q. And it would cost that amount of money more for your large corporation?

A. Yes, sir; simply the making up of the pay-roll. Of course the next thing would be the handling of the money.

Q. That could not be very considerable.

MR. R. D. SMITH. How long does it take you to pay off?

MR. ANDERSON. Before I went to the Pacific mill I was an exam-

inner of mills, going from one mill to another, and I thought I knew something about them, from going into them year after year, but I found that there was a good deal more than I had any idea about.

Q. Now, just how many men do you employ in paying off?

A. In just handling the money? I pay every operative employed by the Pacific mills.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) How much time do you consume in paying off?

A. Well, sir, in actual time in paying off it takes from eight to nine hours.

Q. Then, if you paid off four times a month, it would take you—

A. Eight or nine hours every single time and more; I say more, and I speak from experience.

Q. About forty hours' time, if you paid weekly?

A. Well, that is hardly fair; I said I did it in 8 or 9 hours.

Q. I am giving you from one to two hours extra each week.

A. Yes, sir, but I say more; I can pay very rapidly at the first of the pay, but during the last of it I can't pay so fast. The money is put up in the office in these envelopes, which I have brought here and would like to show to you. I told the clerk to copy just one page of the pay-roll, and here are the envelopes that we put the money up in. I take these envelopes in trunks into the mill with the money due to the operatives. The operative hands me a pay bill, such as I showed you here, and in exchange for it he gets the envelope having the money due him.

Q. Now, if I understand you, if you were to pay off once a week in place of once a month, it would cost your factory or corporation 18 days at the outside in making up the pay-roll, and three days' time in paying off; so that 21 days' labor would be the extreme figure. I am only taking your own system.

A. Well, the money has to be put up in the envelopes, and it takes a good deal of time.

Q. Well, you didn't include that part?

A. No, sir. In handling the money it is three good, solid, tire-some days' work to count that money and put it into the envelopes, for one man to count it, and another to verify it.

Q. That would add nine days more?

A. Yes, sir, twelve; it would take three days to put the money up, and it takes eight or nine hours to pay it out.

Q. Well, then, call it twelve; that would be 33 days?

A. Twelve and 3 are fifteen; 3 days to count it out, and eight or nine hours to pay it out, and there is not any man that can follow that weekly.

Q. Do you know whether it is any more fatiguing than for a man to handle money at a railroad station?

A. Yes, sir; it is more fatiguing than to handle money at a rail-

road station, because there are no breaks at all ; I sit down in the morning to count money, and I count money right straight along until it comes night, and there is not a break. It is very close figuring right along ; more so than a railroad station, because the amounts are to a point, and in the case of the railroad station the amounts are on the decimals ; it makes a very material difference.

Q. (By Mr. Gunn.) Do you take receipts from the operatives?

A. Yes.

Q. How do they get the pay-bills?

A. Those are given them by the overseers before I come around ; sometimes in the morning and sometimes two or three days ahead ; giving the operatives an opportunity for seeing that the amount for which they are to receive their pay does not accord with their account or tally as they have kept it, and the matter is reconciled before they are paid. Speaking of this matter of putting up money and paying out money, you cannot always multiply the amount by the time ; that is, a certain amount of work done in a given amount of time, you cannot do four, five, six or seven times the amount of that work in the same amount of increased time.

Q. Now, you know something of the Lowell corporation, at Lowell, I suppose?

A. Oh, yes, sir.

Q. Is your system of manufacturing more complicated than the manufacture of carpets?

A. Well, sir, I don't know about the manufacture of carpets.

Q. How often do the Lowell carpet mills pay?

A. They pay once a fortnight.

Q. What I want to know is whether they have any difficulty in making up their pay-roll, or in paying once a fortnight, more than they formerly did?

A. I don't know.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Mr. Bennett, it has been suggested to me that it was desirable to know, and perhaps you asked, how many varieties of work you pay for as piece work?

A. Well, sir, in the cotton mill I should think there were 100, but in the woolen mill it is so very varied that I could not form any conception ; I only know that I have found on one page of the pay-roll 40 prices.

Q. All different kinds of work?

A. No, sir ; prices simply, and that does not give, by any means, the kind of work, because there may be two, three, five, 20, 50 kinds for the same price.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) That preliminary work is done by the overseers, isn't it ; the setting down of the kind of work and the price is done by the overseers, isn't it?

A. It is done under the supervision of the overseers. Our work

is changing all the time. To-day we may have orders to change over a lot of looms that may carry with them 20 or 30 different kinds or styles of goods, but it may not carry more than two or three prices. It may cover 20 different kinds of work.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) How is it that it is practically a different kind of work when it is so many yards at such a price? What has style to do about it, when it is simply a certain price for so much cloth?

A. Well, sir, the work has all to be kept separate, and we have to take each style and keep that separate, and work that up and aggregate the pay.

Q. That is preliminary work which the paymaster has nothing to do with.

A. The paymaster has nothing to do with it, though it has directly a bearing on the amount of work that has to be done.

Q. Can you go to an overseer and find out at any moment how a person's work stands?

A. I can find out what it is at present, by taking time for it.

Q. I see you state that you take out deductions for rent, and so I suppose you don't have any connection with any grocery store?

A. No, sir, we haven't any connection with any grocery store; not even an assignment. In the whole city there is not an assignment that is binding on the Pacific mill. I am free to pay every single dollar that is due to every operative without regard to grocery stores or any others.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Are you free from the law of trustee process, too?

A. No, sir. I would say we have very few trustees, and a year or two ago I had the figures here that I made up about this matter of trustees, and it is even less now than it used to be. I have a system by which, if a trustee is sent, I fill out a blank and send it directly to the operative, giving the name of the party and also of the lawyer bringing or serving the writ. I find that it has obviated almost entirely the trouble that formerly arose from this matter of trustees. In the last three or four months I don't remember but one writ that was entered in court.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) If an operative should assign his wages would you honor it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then your rule is not to pay them?

A. My rule is to pay the operative. The operative is the one I look to; the operative is the one I am working for, and it is not the store people.

Q. The operative can make an assignment if he wants to?

A. Yes, many of them do assign their pay, but that is a matter between themselves and their store-keeper.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Do you discharge an operative who assigns his wages?

A. No, sir.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) I suppose it is because they understand you will not take any notice of them?

A. If they come in, I tell them it is their legal right to have that assignment, and it is the operative's legal right to make it; and it is my legal right to break that assignment, which I will do with the greatest pleasure, and I do it.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Can you tell us how you do it?

A. I send word to the overseer to discharge that person for the sake of breaking that assignment and to hire him in again at once. That is, to discharge him as he goes out to dinner, and to hire him as he comes in from dinner.

Q. Do they always hire him over again?

A. I never knew of an instance where the discharge was for that purpose where they didn't hire him over again; the overseers understand it perfectly.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) I have heard it said that if an operative assigned his wages he was discharged.

A. Well, I say no; but at the same time, the assignment is broken, and I think that you lawyers will admit that a discharge of that kind will break an assignment.

Q. (By Mr. Gunn.) I would like to know if your operatives are content under the present system of payment? Or whether they desire more frequent payment?

A. Well, sir, I suppose there is no one who has a better opportunity of getting at that than I do, and I say so somewhat modestly—I say it because it is a matter that I have honestly tried to get at. My belief is that what is for the welfare of the operative is for the welfare of the corporation.

MR. SMITH of West Newbury. I agree with you there, sir.

MR. ANDERSON. I have their entire confidence and they believe that I am a friend of the people, the working people there in our mill. It is something that I have labored to attain, and it is something that I feel very happy in believing to be a fact. There are cases where some of the people would like to receive their pay more frequently, but I state it here, gentlemen, believing it fully, that a very, very, very large proportion of our people are satisfied with the present arrangement.

Q. (By Mr. Smith of West Newbury.) I suppose if an operative wished for his pay once a week or once a fortnight as an exceptional case, you might pay him, if he found himself in a tight place and wanted some money?

A. Well, that is a matter personal; I have a great deal of latitude given to me, and there have been cases where operatives have

been in trouble, where they have had sickness or some disaster has overtaken them, and I have paid them their wages. I have, in certain cases, paid them their wages in advance. That is a matter entirely personal, and I say I have latitude in the matter.

Q. You do that on your own responsibility?

A. I do it because I believe I have a right to do it.

Q. It is simply a matter between you and the operatives?

A. Wherever the case comes certified to me by an overseer, that the operatives should have their money due them, I pay it.

Q. You do it on your own responsibility?

A. I do it because I believe I have a right to do it.

Q. It is simply on your own responsibility and not a rule of the mill?

A. No, it is on my own responsibility, doing what I believe to be an act of justice for the operatives and for the welfare of all concerned.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Whether you think you have latitude enough, discretion enough, so that the directors would pay you the money in case he ran away or died?

A. I have no doubt of it.

Q. (By Mr. Sargent.) You always pay every time-bill that is presented to you?

A. Every time-bill has been paid that has been brought into the office up to the present time.

Q. Then the overseer has some discretion?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. (By Mr. O'Sullivan.) Did you find time to read the letter published in the "Journal" from Mr. Wainwright of the Arlington mills?

A. I did.

Q. Could you give the committee your opinion about it, in regard to the practicability, or what you think about it as applied to your corporation?

A. I say that Mr. Wainwright is not competent to decide a question or express an opinion which is of any very great value in regard to the Pacific mills.

Q. They pay something like 2,000 people at the Arlington?

A. They have two paymasters to two mills. The worsted mill have on their books,—we will give them their figures,—somewhere in the vicinity of 1,400. They pay weekly. They pay every Friday for the preceding week. The week ends on Saturday and they pay the following Friday. And, as I have said, you can get a man to run half a mile in a certain time, but he can't run five miles and keep that up. Why, just think of it; putting up money and paying it out for 5,000 people, carries my hand in the motions over 10 miles every month. By the weekly system it has got to be done every

week. There is a certain amount of headwork and handwork which can be done up to a certain point, but cannot be multiplied.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. I would cheerfully give assent to what Mr. Anderson has said about his obtaining the good wishes of the operatives and trying to subserve the best interests of his help. That is a fact. But you see, Mr. Anderson, that I flatter our State on having a superior quality of operatives, and you possess your share of that class. Don't you think it is more universal than you state to the committee, this desire for more frequent payments?

A. No, sir.

Q. Honestly—I don't question your honesty—but has your observation led you so far that you can say, actually not?

A. I say not, not from any opinion, but from the actual expressions of opinion to me by the operatives. As I see them in and around the rooms, as I see them in and out of the mill, I have asked a great many of them, and they don't want it.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Let me ask you a question upon this point. It is rather against our side perhaps, but whether the people who came to you to express their views on this subject were acquainted with your opinion so that they would be likely to express their opinion against monthly payments rather than in favor of them, and in favor of weekly payments, because they know how you feel about it?

A. In talking with the operatives many and many a time; I have talked in favor of weekly payments with a view to drawing them out and trying to get at the true inwardness of their opinion, and I think that in view of that conversation I am fully warranted in expressing my firm belief from actual contact with the operatives and knowing fully what I am talking about, that the statement is true which I made, that a very, very large majority of our operatives do not want more frequent payments.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. The reason that I repeated that question was that it seems very problematical to me, knowing from the reputation that Mr. Anderson bears, that it would not be looked at in the light of intimidating or bulldozing them, how these very people who, he states, express that desire to him, or not a desire for more frequent payments to me and to others who have for a long time inquired of them, should express just the opposite opinion.

MR. R. D. SMITH. They are afraid of you and they are not afraid of Anderson.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. Not in my district at all.

MR. ANDERSON. No, Mr. Smith, that is not it. But they know what Mr. O'Sullivan's opinions on that question are, and they know what he wants to get at; he meets more of that class of people, and does not meet the other class as I do. I suppose I meet more operatives, and I know I meet with more of the traders in Lawrence than

perhaps any other paymaster, or all the other paymasters put together.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. Or any other man or all of them put together. I will put it as far as that.

MR. ANDERSON. Starting out with my idea, that what is for the welfare of the operatives is for the welfare of the corporation. I have gone to work honestly upon that basis. If it is for the benefit of the operatives, let us have it; if it is not going to benefit them any, what is the use of legislating? If it is not for their benefit for God's sake don't legislate. Now, from what I have learned from meeting with the operatives you have got my opinion. On meeting with the trade I have taken pains for several years to ask those that I have met when they came into the office, what would be the effect of weekly payments, as carried on at the Arlington mills; and I think, if I should let some of the traders have full scope, the air would be blue in the office when they have told me of the amount of money they have lost from operatives working at the Arlington mills who receive their pay weekly. You know Mr. —?

MR. O'SULLIVAN. Yes, sir.

MR. ANDERSON. He was in the office the other day and he told me as regards the people employed by him, that through the summer they were employed by the city and received their wages every week; they received from \$1.50 to \$1.75 a day; and Mr. — said his life was almost hounded out of him by those men who came to him now and said they must have work or else they had got to go onto the town for support, and in order to keep them off the city, he had picked out the poorest of the men, and was giving them work just for that purpose, because they are worthy parties. This is a matter of fact; it is not a matter of opinion. Furthermore, Mr. — said that from time to time operatives working with us at the Pacific would go to the Arlington mills. Up to the time that they left us they had been honest and good pay. After they had gone up to the Arlington mills as a rule those operatives got behind hand. They say it was a rule with the operatives there to run their accounts monthly, although they received their pay weekly, and then at the end of the month come in with one week's pay in their pocket and want to give part of that week's pay on account; and it had got so bad that the first of this last January, he gave his bookkeeper orders to trust no one who received pay weekly, because he could not get the money out of them. I mention him because you know him perfectly well, and he is a very fair man; he didn't tell that to be repeated. When I say that I say what has been stated to me over and over again, by storekeeper after storekeeper.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. By men of Mr. —'s calibre and standing?

MR. ANDERSON. No. Well, we will take Mr. Shattuck. He is an incorruptible man. He will say the very same thing. Mr. Shat-

tuck has been down here to say it, and he will say it today. I am simply talking to you because you know the names; and it carries more weight where it is not a matter of opinion, but where it is the name of a person you know.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) You say you argued for weekly payments in order to learn the opinion of the operatives?

A. I said I talked that side.

Q. Now, is it surprising that the operative should be a little cautious and a little suspicious in talking with a man who is talking against his convictions?

A. No, I don't think that would follow at all, because in order to get at the opinion of a person, it is not every person who can express his opinion, and you have to draw it out by conversation. You know that perfectly well. Sometimes in talking of a measure you will get an intelligent opinion out of a person which they are not able to express, and it was in order to help them in formulating an expression of opinion that I talked with them.

Q. Don't you believe that operatives are a little suspicious of conversation with an office man in regard to this matter?

A. Perhaps Mr. O'Sullivan could answer that question.

Q. I ask you if you don't believe it is so?

A. No, sir; I don't think there is an operative that is suspicious of me in the least.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. I don't believe they are.

Q. Would you blame him if he was, when you talked with him and argued contrary to your candid convictions?

A. I didn't say I talked with him or argued with him against my conviction. I said I sometimes talked in favor of weekly payments. I believe, sir, that I can get at as considerate, as honest, as true an opinion from the operatives as anyone here.

Q. (By Mr. O'Sullivan.) Well, if it should appear, Mr. Anderson, notwithstanding your opinion in the matter, that it would be for the benefit of the great majority of the people, and if it should also appear that the matter was practicable—

A. The old saying is: "If you put ifs enough in you can move the world." It is not for the benefit of the majority, and it is not practicable so far as the Pacific mills are concerned.

Q. That is your opinion?

A. No, sir; it is not a matter of opinion. So far as practicability of carrying it out in the Pacific mills is concerned, I say it cannot be done.

Q. How long have you been paymaster, Mr. Anderson?

A. I have been paymaster going on 6 years, and before that I was an examiner of pay-rolls at mills.

Q. By (Mr. R. D. Smith.) One thing I want to ask you because the committee, some of them know you, and they know you

bear this relation to the operatives, and that they have confidence in you. I want to know whether it is a fact that witnesses are terrified and kept from appearing here by fear of being discharged.

A. There is not a person in the Pacific mills who is in any terror or has ever had any threat, or basis of a threat, or shadow of a threat, or any intimation or information that would keep him from here if he wished to come.

Q. (By Mr. O'Sullivan.) Would you let a petition go through your mill?

A. No, sir; we don't let any petitions go through the mill.

Q. (By Mr. Sargent.) Or a remonstrance?

A. No, sir.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) Have you refused a remonstrance?

A. I don't know that there had been anything of the kind started. We don't allow book agents or subscription agents; we don't let subscription papers of any sort go into the mill; we keep them entirely out.

MR. BENNETT. You conveyed to me the idea that a man who received his pay once a week was poor pay, and a man who receives his pay once a month would be better pay?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I want to ask you, in that connection, do you think that an operative, or, in fact, any man not accustomed to handling money in large quantities, could take care of a large sum of money better than a small sum, and handle it more judiciously for his own purpose?

A. Well, Mr. Bennett, you are asking two or three questions in one, begging your pardon.

Q. Well, answer it in your own way.

A. So far as the matter of credit is concerned; the operative that is working for us, and receiving pay every month, receives credit and deserves credit, the expectation being that at the end of the month he will come in and pay the month's bills. The storekeepers know when pay day comes, and the operative comes around and pays his bills. An operative during the month goes and buys a barrel of flour, buys in quantities which are larger than he could buy if he was receiving his pay weekly, and he has better credit for the reason that, at the end of the month, he will receive an amount which will be sufficient to liquidate the entire month's indebtedness. The first week he may have received credit on the books of the storekeeper to the amount of an entire week's pay, and perhaps to the amount of two weeks' pay, but it is with the knowledge that at the end of the month he will receive an amount which will be sufficient to cover that indebtedness, and do something over and above for the family. While under the weekly system, the amount to be received at the end of the week would not be enough to pay. Cases

have been cited over and over again, where persons have left our corporation and gone to the Arlington mills, where they have received their pay weekly. They had come from other corporations, and it is said that under the system of weekly payments they cannot pay their bills. Somehow or other the money went. You know how it is. Money in the pocket goes out before you know it. If they got their monthly stipend—

Q. It is your opinion they would not go round and pay their bills weekly as quickly as they go to pay them once a month?

A. Well, sir, the storekeepers—the grocers and butchers—they tell me that very many of the Arlington mill operatives—I don't say all; I am saying simply what they told me—very many of the Arlington mill people run their accounts just exactly the same.

Q. Well, if they all paid weekly and the stores all would commence the practice of running weekly accounts, wouldn't they get in the habit of paying their bills weekly?

A. Well, there comes up the very question that I told you of; oftentimes a man with family wants to buy more at a time than his weekly wages will pay for. What the storekeepers would do is a matter for them to consider.

Q. You look upon the question of weekly payments as perfectly experimental?

A. I do, so far as the corporations are concerned that are practising it. It is an experimental thing as to its feasibility and as to its effects upon the operatives.

Q. Of course you are aware that there are a large portion of the employes in the Commonwealth that are paid once a week, now?

A. I know there are; and I know, too, that it is a very singular coincidence that a large proportion of the labor troubles that have arisen, have arisen in the communities where the pay is more frequent.

Q. Do you think it is in consequence of weekly payments?

A. I don't know, but I had an English operative talking with me the other day, and he said it was singular that the two worst features of the English system had been imported and were trying to be brought into our manufacturing communities; one was the system of weekly pay, and the other was the system of strikes. He put them both together. That was suggested to me by an English operative.

Q. (By Mr. O'Sullivan.) I have talked with a number who have given me a contrary opinion.

A. Whether it is so or not it is not material. I have had some very interesting experiences with these English people. They receive their pay at home every week, and they don't get as much. Here is simply one case: We had a man come to us in one of our

departments of skilled labor ; it happened to be a five-week pay day ; that week I was paying off in gold ; when that man got that money in hand, I don't know of anything that was a more interesting sight than that man's face. As he stood there I said to the overseer : "He seems pleased." "Yes," he said, "I don't believe he ever had so much money before. Did you, sir?" The operative replied : "My man, I never had so much money as that of my own in my hand before. I never had so much money. And that is mine. Why, I tell you I can pay all my bills, and there is something there that can go into the bank." That is a sample ; that is one case. Over and over again where people have never been paid other than weekly, they have come to our mill, have received their pay according to our present system, and to-day own places in the city of Lawrence, that they themselves say they never could have owned in England, and never would have had in England or anywhere under the weekly system.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) Is not the reason that the wages that they earn in England are not sufficient to leave them a margin over and above the necessary family expenses?

A. Well, sir, if you take the statistics of the labor bureau, you will find them to say that the wages in England and here are not so very different. I am simply stating the fact ; I am not arguing from it. These are simple facts that have come under my observation. People have said to me little pleasant things, where I know that our own operatives have bought and owned their places, and this very man that I paid that money to, has bought a place up in Methuen, and he has got it very nearly paid for. I have talked with him about it from time to time.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) Then, is it the inference that if they had weekly payments your people would not be able to buy any more homes?

A. I don't think they would.

Q. Now, do you know anything about the city of Lynn? We have operatives there.

A. Oh, well, let Lynn people talk about Lynn ; it is not fair to ask my opinion about Lynn.

Q. I want to say to you that in the city of Lynn the weekly payment system has been in practice twenty years or more. Don't you know—you probably do know—that the operatives are better housed, in houses of their own, than they are in any other city of the Commonwealth?

A. I know this : that the city of Lynn keeps stealing some of our best operatives.

MR. BENNETT. We pay them more money than you do, and we are glad to do it.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) In what occupations?

A. I don't know what they go into ; they go into some of the

shoe factories there. Some of the smartest operatives we have had have gone down there.

MR. BENNETT. I am much obliged to you.

MR. ANDERSON. Well, they have; I was talking with a girl the other day, who went from Lawrence to Lynn, and she said she earns more money down there. She told me what she was doing, but I don't remember.

Q. (By Mr. Bennett.) Did you say that laborers in your city of Lawrence don't earn any more pay than they do in England?

A. Did I say so? No. He asked the question, and I said if you took these labor bureau statistics you would find them to state that there was not a very great difference.

MR. BENNETT. I was surprised.

MR. ANDERSON. Well, look at the envelopes if you want to see what they earn.

Q. What do your operatives average to earn?

A. Well, an average is not fair; some of our weavers earn more than \$1.50 a day, and some do not earn a dollar.

Q. What is the average?

A. Our weavers will average from \$1.07 to \$1.15 a day.

Q. How much do your men earn?

A. In what department? Well, we have men all the way from a dollar a day up to \$4 and \$5.

Q. Well, a great majority of your help earn something like \$1, or \$1.25?

A. Somewhere from a dollar to two dollars. But you cannot average it.

Q. What is the gross amount?

A. Well, you have the pay-roll here; this happens to be a five weeks' pay-roll; this pay-roll was for \$164,341.26.

Q. For 5,500 men.

A. It will run between \$30,000 and \$40,000 a week. Last month's pay-roll was for five weeks, and it was for about \$164,000. I have had it up to over \$190,000, but it will run somewhere to between less than \$40,000 and over \$30,000 a week. And right here I want to say that in talking with the banks, the officers of the banks have stated that it is a very serious matter so far as they are concerned, and they question whether they would be able to furnish the bills which we would require—one and two dollar bills. They could not do it.

Q. (By Mr. Russell.) I see by the pay-roll for the weave room that the wages are from \$13.72 up to \$33 for five weeks.

A. I am giving you the average. It is with great difficulty that we get all the small bills, the one and two dollar bills, that we require for the pay-roll now; and when I could not get them for a few months I had to use silver. It took six hundred pounds in weight of silver every month to pay what I use, and if we should pay every week it would take more than that.

Q. (By Mr. R. D. Smith.) I want to know whether there has been any effect, so far as you have learned, from weekly payments, upon the intemperance of operatives?

A. If I should say yes, somebody else would say no. I don't think, as a rule, that our operatives are intemperate. Not but what they might take something occasionally, but I don't think as a rule that operatives are what you may call intemperate; no more than I think, as a rule, they are immoral. I think operatives as a class are both temperate and moral. I am speaking simply of Lawrence now. It is a fact—I don't draw any deductions from it, but you take the Arlington mills, which are doing so much in the direction of weekly payments, and a gentleman competent to know about the matter quietly walked up around the Arlington mills the other day, and I am told, and I have no reason to doubt it from my observation riding by, that on the street running from the Brown mills, almost within a stone's throw, there are nine shops that sell rum and liquor. And almost within a stone's throw of Goodrich's and the entrance to the Arlington mills,—and that is not a very great thoroughfare,—it is what would be called a small street,—there are 15 places that sell liquor, and that is a fact which don't obtain, so far as I can judge, in any other locality in the city.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. I would just qualify that a little by saying that the sudden upgrowth of these rumshops is equally as large, if not larger, in some other places. Even in the district surrounding your corporation, or on the main street, you can count as many in the same period of time that they have been built up on Park street.

MR. ANDERSON. I should not question your statement, Mr. O'Sullivan, but I didn't know the rumshops were so prevalent anywhere except on Common street.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. I speak from observation and an inspection of the records at the City Clerk's office, which it was my business the other day to look at.

MR. ANDERSON. Well, they have sprung up and congregated more around the Arlington mills than in any other portion of the city. I don't wish to draw any inference.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. I will say right here while it is fresh in our minds, in regard to this man who has been spoken of as Mr.,—— and it is a very apt name—this man, who, unfortunately—and I wish this to remain with the committee—has been to the commission a useless appendage—this man's books, if submitted to this committee as non-partisan men, simply interested in getting at the logical outcome, are a monument to the stupidity and ignorance of that man, and of that class of grocers and liquor dealers, that class that sell liquor in connection with their grocery shops, and that is almost the curse of Lawrence and Lowell, or anywhere else where they exist—this man who talked about what he had suffered in losing his

bills, he ought to lose them. I say that, Mr. Anderson, entirely apart from anything you have stated.

MR. ANDERSON. I didn't go into the matter personally, I simply stated what he said to me. Shattuck Brothers, who are by no means of that class, but are in every respect worthy of the utmost credence, state the same thing, only more so.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. Well, they might; they are in a certain quarter, and differ essentially from the rest.

MR. ANDERSON. They have been down here and stated it, and Joseph Shattuck said he would come down and tell the whole thing.

MR. O'SULLIVAN. I wish they would come down. We can put in matter about that which would answer them fairly and fully.

MR. ANDERSON. I have endeavored to give you simple facts, and not opinions.







3 0112 061962327